

REMARKS

Claims 1-33, 35, and 36 were pending in the application when previously examined, all of which stand rejected. Claims 1, 15, 20, 35, and 36 are independent. In the present Response, all the independent claims are amended.

Applicant's Reply to Examiner's Response to Arguments

The Office Action dated May 2, 2011 ("the Office Action") states, "...Claim 1 does not have any limitation regarding "remotely configuring" anything. ... The same applies for claims 15, 35, and 36" [see page 11 of the Office Action]. Claims 1, 15, 35, and 36 are amended to address this concern.

Specifically, Claim 1 is amended to recite that the mobile unit "remotely receiv[es] the configuration command" and "automatically ... generate[s] a report according to the configuration command...."

Claim 15 is amended to recite "a processor ... configured to generate a report according to a remotely-received configuration command...."

Claim 35 is amended to recite "means for remotely receiving a configuration command."

Claim 36 is amended to recite "remotely receiving a configuration command...."

Regarding Claim 20, the Office Action that its limitations "...do not state anything about the mobile terminal automatically generating a report. ...This means that in claim 20, the report can be automatically generated by any device, not necessarily the mobile terminal" [see page 11 of the Office Action]. Claim 20 is amended to explicitly recite that

the automatic preparation is done “via the mobile unit” to address this concern. Hence, Claim 20 recites that the mobile unit automatically prepares a report in accordance with the configuration command, which is remotely received.

These amendments, in combination with the Remarks presented in the Response of February 24, 2011, place the claims in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 20-25 and 27-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,219,694 to Lazaridis et al. (“Lazaridis”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,200,409 to Ichikawa (“Ichikawa”). Claims 1-19, 26, 35, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lazaridis and Ichikawa, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,366,522 to Thomas (“Thomas”).

All pending claims are patentable over the cited references because none of the cited references discloses the remote report-configuration capability that is recited in the independent claims. Specifically, Claim 1 is patentable because it recites “a user interface unit that generates and transmits a configuration command for configuring a report” and “a mobile unit ... [that] generate[s] a report according to the configuration command...” Independent Claim 15 is patentable because it recites “A mobile communication device comprising ... a processor ... configured to generate a report according to a remotely-received configuration command” Independent Claim 20 is patentable because it recites “remotely receiving a configuration command about configurations for a report; automatically preparing the report in accordance with the configurations” Independent Claims 35 and 36 are patentable because they recite “... remotely receiving a configuration

command” and “... preparing a report ...[that] includes data requested in the configuration command...”

The Office Action acknowledges that Lazaridis does not teach a user interface unit that generates and transmits a configuration command and a mobile unit collecting data and automatically using the data to generate a report according to the configuration command [the Office Action, page 2]. However, the Office Action points to Ichikawa as disclosing this limitation [the Office Action, page 2].

Applicant respectfully disagrees that Ichikawa teaches a user interface unit that generates and transmits a configuration command and a mobile unit that automatically generates a report according to the configuration command. Upon careful review of Ichikawa including the sections that are cited in the latest Office Action, it appears that Ichikawa discloses an on-vehicle terminal and a separate mobile terminal that has some of the functions of the conventional on-vehicle terminal. The idea is that if an emergency occurs, the escaping crew can carry the mobile terminal and use it to report information to the center. However, nowhere in Ichikawa does it mention that the report generated by the mobile terminal can be remotely configured – e.g., from the center – via a configuration command. Ichikawa does not discuss how someone at the center would remotely change the information included in the report that is generated by the mobile terminal.

Thomas, which allegedly teaches formatting the report according to an electronic mail protocol, fails to cure the deficiency in Lazaridis and Ichikawa. Hence, Lazaridis, Ichikawa, and Thomas, even in various combinations, fail to disclose all the limitations recited in the independent claims.

Claims 2-14, 16-19, and 21-33 depend from independent Claims 1, 15, and 20 and are thus patentable over the cited references for the same reason as the independent claims.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks set forth above, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Authorization is given to charge any fees due or credit any overpayments in regard to this communication to deposit account 50-5029. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns, a telephone call to the undersigned at (408) 331-1672 is welcomed and encouraged.

Certification of Electronic Transmission

Certificate of Transmission: I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) via the USPTO's EFS-Web electronic system on:

June 13, 2011

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Kieun "Jenny" Sung

/Kieun "Jenny" Sung/

Respectfully submitted,

/Kieun "Jenny" Sung/

Kieun "Jenny" Sung
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 48,639

Innovation Counsel LLP

21771 Stevens Creek Boulevard, Suite 200
Cupertino, California 95014
Telephone: (408) 331-1670
Facsimile: (408) 725-8263
E-mail: jsung@innovationcounsel.com